



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/621,286	07/17/2003	Adrian Chandley	MSFT-1973/304061.1	2492
41505	7590	08/31/2005	EXAMINER	
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP ONE LIBERTY PLACE - 46TH FLOOR PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			PAPE, ZACHARY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2835	
DATE MAILED: 08/31/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AK

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/621,286

Applicant(s)

CHANDLEY, ADRIAN

Examiner

Zachary M. Pape

Art Unit

2835

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 June 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-11 and 13-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-11, 13-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3/30/2005 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 10-11, 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With respect to claim 10, the phrase, "the at least one external computer for communicating with the mobile docking station" is incorrect and appears to be redundant since the recitation, "a communication interface for communicating with the at least one external computer" already draws the connection between the one external computer and the mobile docking station communicating.

Additionally in claim 10, line 3 the phrase, "the mobile computer" lacks antecedent basis. It appears that it should be changed to read, "a mobile computer".

Claims 11, 13-20 are rejected for at least the reason that claim 10 is rejected.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamijo et al. (US 6,538,880) in view of Goshey et al. (US 6,473,783).

With respect to claim 1, Kamijo et al. teaches the use of a docking station (110) for a mobile computer (120), the docking station (110) absent a computer core when the mobile computer (120) is uninstalled, the docking station comprising: a port (1110), for receiving the mobile computer (120), a communication interface (Column 5, Lines 44-46 teaches that the docking station (110) has wireless communication capabilities) for communicating with at least one external computer, and a display (115) for depicting information exchanged with the at least one external computer, wherein the docking station is itself mobile and enables the communication interface to acquire the information and to display the information when the mobile computer is not installed into the port; and wherein the docking station enables communications with the mobile computer when the mobile computer is installed into the port (Column 3, Lines 40-47;

Art Unit: 2835

Column 3, Lines 61-67). Kamijo et al. fails to teach that the communication interface communicates with an external computer separate from the mobile computer (120).

Goshey et al. teaches the conventionality of a docking station (112a) communicating with an external computer (112b, 112c, 112d). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the computer communications art to provide a separate external computer as taught by Goshey et al. to communicate with the docking station (110) of Kamijo et al. to further expand the operation capabilities (attachment to peripheral devices, etc.) of the docking station (110) thus reducing the need to purchase redundant peripheral devices for each local computer system (Goshey et al; Column 2, Lines 4-7). Additionally utilizing the peripheral devices of an external computer as taught by Goshey et al. through a communication interface rids the user of the necessity of attaching the docking station directly to the peripheral device thus saving time.

With respect to claim 10, in so far as can be understood by the examiner, Kamijo et al. teaches a system supporting communications between a mobile docking station and at least one external computer comprising: a mobile docking station (110) that is absent a computer core when the mobile computer is uninstalled, the docking station comprising: a port (1110) for receiving the mobile computer (120), a communication interface (Column 5, Lines 44-46 teaches that the docking station (110) has wireless communication capabilities) for communicating with the at least one external computer, wherein the external computer, and a display (115) for depicting information exchanged with the at least one external computer, and the at least one external computer for communicating with the mobile docking station; wherein the mobile docking station

Art Unit: 2835

(110) enables the communications interface to support communication with the at least one external computer when the mobile computer is both uninstalled from the docking station and without communications with the docking station (The communications interface of the docking station is enabled to communicate with any other external computers through, for example, a traditional wireless network without the mobile computer installed), and wherein the mobile docking station supports communication with at least one external device when the mobile computer is installed (Column 2, Lines 61-62). Kamijo et al. fails to teach that the communication interface communicates with an external computer separate from the mobile computer (120).

Goshey et al. teaches the conventionality of a docking station (112a) communicating with an external computer (112b, 112c, 112d). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the computer communications art to provide a separate external computer as taught by Goshey et al. to communicate with the docking station (110) of Kamijo et al. to further expand the operation capabilities (attachment to peripheral devices, etc.) of the docking station (110) thus reducing the need to purchase redundant peripheral devices for each local computer system (Goshey et al; Column 2, Lines 4-7). Additionally utilizing the peripheral devices of an external computer as taught by Goshey et al. through a communication interface rids the user of the necessity of attaching the docking station directly to the peripheral device thus saving time.

With respect to claims 2 and 11, in so far as can be understood by the examiner, Kamijo et al. illustrates in Figure 1 that the display is integrated with the docking station.

With respect to claim 3, Kamijo et al. teaches that the port for receiving the mobile computer comprises a connector (Column 4, Lines 53-54).

With respect to claim 4, Kamijo et al. further teaches that the port further receives a chassis for the mobile computer (As illustrated in Fig 1).

With respect to claims 6, and 13, in so far as can be stood by the examiner, Kamijo et al. further teaches a user interface comprising one or more of a keyboard (As illustrated in Fig 1), a mouse, a touch screen, a light pen, a stylus, audio interface, tactile transducer, vibration transducer, and an external connector for an external input/output device permitting interaction with rendered information on the display.

With respect to claim 7, Kamijo et al. further teaches a receptacle (412) for receiving electrical power (to the mobile computer (120)).

With respect to claims 8 and 14, in so far as can be stood by the examiner, Kamijo et al. further discloses that the communication interface for communicating with at least one external computer is one or more of a wireless connection and a wired connection (Column 5, Line 46).

With respect to claims 9 and 20, in so far as can be stood by the examiner, Kamijo et al. further teaches that the mobile computer (120) is one of an ultra compact computer, a computer core, a handheld computer, and a laptop computer (As illustrated in Fig 4).

With respect to claim 15, in so far as can be stood by the examiner, Kamijo et al. teaches that the wireless connection is one or more of a radio frequency connection, an infrared connection and an acoustic connection (Column 3, Lines 64-65).

With respect to claim 16, in so far as can be stood by the examiner, Goshey et al. further teaches that the at least one external device is one or more of a remote computer (112b) and a peripheral device (118).

With respect to claim 17, in so far as can be stood by the examiner, Goshey et al. further teaches that the remote computer is one or more of a desktop computer and a laptop computer (As illustrated in Fig 2a computer 112b is a desktop computer).

With respect to claim 18, in so far as can be stood by the examiner, Goshey et al. further teaches that the peripheral device is one or more of a peripheral device connected to a computer system (As illustrated in Fig 2a of Goshey) and a stand alone peripheral device.

With respect to claims 19, in so far as can be stood by the examiner, Kamijo et al. further teaches that the at least one external device is one or more of a networking interface, a personal digital assistant, and one or more mobile docking stations (Column 5, Lines 44-46; the mobile computer is clearly able to wirelessly communicate with other external devices and thus is enabled to communicate with, for example one or more mobile docking stations similar to the mobile docking station of Kamijo et al.)

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zachary M. Pape whose telephone number is 571-272-2201. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Thur. & every other Fri. (8:00am - 5:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn Feild can be reached at 571-272-2092. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ZMP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'A. Vortman', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

ANATOLY VORTMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER